

**REMARKS**

Applicant amends claims 1, 8 and 15 and add new claim 24. Accordingly, claims 1-24 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define patentable subject matter. The newly added features are at least supported by page 21, line 16 to page 22, line 11 and FIGS. 3 and 4 of the specification.

**I. Statement of Substance of Interview**

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned thanks Examiner Dohm CHANKONG for the courtesy of the interview conducted on October 18, 2010. During the interview, the undersigned and the Examiner discussed the patentability of independent claims 1, 8 and 15. In particular, the undersigned asserted that the cited prior art references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose “the at least one port module determines a last status of the data source and reconnects the remote application to the data source based on the determination of the last status of the data source”, as recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15. In response, the Examiner maintained that the combination of Guenthner and Ohran allegedly discloses these feature of claims 1, 8 and 15. No agreement was reached with regard to this feature. However, the Examiner indicated that the newly added features of claims 1, 8 and 15, which recites “wherein the port module determines a last status of the data source and reconnects the remote application to the data source based on the determination of the last status of the data source by directly communicating with the remote application and bypassing the connection manager,” distinguishes the claims over the cited prior art references.

## **II. Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1-19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Polizzi et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0023158; hereinafter “*Polizzi*”) in view of *Guenthner et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,134,588; hereinafter “*Guenthner*”), and further in view of *Ohran et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,748; hereinafter “*Ohran*”).

Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Polizzi* and *Guenther* in view of *Brendel et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,660; hereinafter “*Brendal*”).

Applicant traverses the rejection as follows.

### **Claims 1, 8 and 15**

Without conceding to the merits of the rejection, Applicant amends claims 1, 8 and 15 to recite, *inter alia*, “wherein the port module determines a last status of the data source and reconnects the remote application to the data source based on the determination of the last status of the data source **by directly communicating with the remote application and bypassing the connection manager**. ” Applicant respectfully submits that the applied prior art references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claim 1.

For instance, Ohran discloses that the NETWARE loadable module sets communication means to disconnect mass storage system 122 from computer 121 and connects it to computer 111 (column 8, lines 23-28). However, Ohran does not teach or suggest “the port module determines a last status of the data source and reconnects the remote application to the data source based on the determination of the last status of the data source **by directly communicating with the remote application and bypassing the connection manager**. ”

Also, Polizzi and Guenthner do not teach or suggest “the port module determines a last status of the data source and reconnects the remote application to the data source based on the determination of the last status of the data source **by directly communicating with the remote application and bypassing the connection manager.**

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 8 and 15 are patentable over the cited combination of references.

**Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-23**

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-23 that depend from claims 1, 8 and 15 are patentable over the cited combination of references at least by virtue of their dependency and the additional features recited therein.

**III. New claim**

Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 24 depends from claim 1, and therefore is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency and the additional features recited therein.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/750,475

Attorney Docket No.: A8644  
IBM Ref. No: STL919990134US3

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Ebenesar D. Thomas/  
Ebenesar D. Thomas  
Registration No. 62,499

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

**46159**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 21, 2010